DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 909 CG 004 894

AUTHOR JONES, ALLAN P.
TITLE SELF-REPORTED AND JUDGED PERSONALITY, VALUE, AND ATTITUDINAL PATTERNS: A COMPARISON OF USERS AND NON USERS OF LSD-25.
INSTITUTION COLORADO UNIV., BOULDER. INST. OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE.
PUB DATE 15 MAY 69
NOTE 18P.; PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, MAY 14--17, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS *ATTITUDES, COLLEGE STUDENTS, DRUG ABUSE, GOAL ORIENTATION, *LYSERGIC ACID DIETHYLAMIDE, MARIHUANA, *PERSONALITY ASSESSMENT, *PERSONAL VALUES, RESEARCH PROJECTS, *SOCIALLY DEVIANT BEHAVIOR, SOCIAL VALUES

ABSTRACT

THIS STUDY IS DESIGNED TO ASSESS THE BENEFITS OF LSD USE AS WELL AS TO EXAMINE PERSONALITY, VALUE, AND ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES IN ORDER TO CHARACTERIZE USERS AND NON USERS. THE MAIN ASSESSMENT TOOL USED WAS THE IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW. SUBJECTS WERE 31 MALE AND 8 FEMALE USERS AND A NON USER GROUP MATCHED FOR EDUCATION AND AGE. THE USER WAS CHARACTERIZED BY AN ALIENATION FROM CONVENTIONAL SOCIETY AND ITS VALUES, A LACK OF COMMITMENT TO A FORMAL ORGANIZED RELIGION, A SEARCHING FOR VALUES, A LACK OF CLEAR GOALS, AND A CERTAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL INEFFECTIVENESS. IN REGARD TO FURTHER RESEARCH, ATTENTION MUST BE GIVEN TO THOSE WHO USE MARIJUANA OR LSD INFREQUENTLY. THE STUDY WAS LIMITED BY A DIFFICULTY IN DEVELOPING AND DEFINING DIMENSIONS WHICH CUT ACROSS ALL OF THE GROUPS AND THE USE OF A SAMPLE DRAWN FROM A POPULATION VARYING LITTLE BETWEEN USERS AND NON USERS. (EK)

ED035909

Presented at the RMPA Symposium on Alcohol and Drug Use;

May 15, 1969

Albuquerque, New Mexico

# SELF-REPORTED AND JUDGED PERSONALITY, VALUE, AND ATTITUDINAL PATTERNS: A COMPARISON OF USERS AND NON USERS OF LSD-25

by

Allan P. Jones[1]

Institute of Behavioral Science

University of Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

[1]Supported in part by a Grant from the University of Colorado's Council on Research and Creative Work, Keith E. Davis, Ph. D. Principal Investigator.

CG004894

LSD-25 is unusual, and possibly unequalled, in its ability to alter, temporarily, states of consciousness, perception, ideation, and sense of time. Because of its potency, the drug has become embroiled in an emotional furor in which expansive claims of its powers to enhance self-understanding and self-fulfillment have been made by its proponents; while, at the same time, its opponents, have been just as vociferous in warnings of dire consequences such as drug-induced psychoses or genetic damage produced by such a diabolical agent. (Alpert, 1966; Eddy et al., 1965; Louria, 1966; Masters, 1967; Smith, 1967; Watts, 1962)

The aim of this study was a sympathetic assessment of the alleged benefits of LSD use as well as a comprehensive examination of personality, value, and attitudinal variables which might differentiate or characterize users and non or anti-users.

The primary and most persistently encountered justifications for the use of LSD-25 have to do with either sensory and intellectual stimulation, or greater understanding of self and the liberation and enhancement of one's creative potential ("doing one's head" as it is put in the subculture). (Roseman, 1963)

Our major tool for assessing the benefits of use was an in-depth interview lasting between 1½ and 2 hours. We had originally planned to spend several hours in association with each subject and also to obtain three month follow-up data, but problems of time and maintaining contact prevented this.

We were, therefore, forced to compromise with the results that the data presented today are from a one-time cross-sectional design executed in Boulder, Colorado during the spring of 1968.

Because broad personality information was desired, judgment by an interviewer on various dimensions of self-understanding was the chosen method. The interview was loosely structured according to an interview guide in order to insure that the same areas of information would be gathered for each subject. (The interviewer

was free to pursue an area until he felt competant to rate the subject on that dimension, but he was directed to cover all the areas.)

The interview was recorded, thereby allowing the other two judges to listen to the tape and then rate the subject.

Interjudge agreement on all types of ratings was evaluated in two ways--percent agreement and interjudge correlation. In all cases, agreement was moderate-to-high (ranging from 61.5% to 94.7% on the various items for the different pairs of judges). Due to the level of interjudge agreement, all data presented in the remainder of this paper will be based on the average rating across the three judges.

All data were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance by extent of use. The independent variable was subdivided into four frequency of use categories--none, light (average use up to 3 times a year), medium (average use from once a month to once a week), and heavy use (average use greater than once a week).

Although all users were selected on the basis of LSD use, it was noted that all subjects also reported marijuana use. Whenever possible, the relationship for marijuana use will be included and compared with the patterns discovered for LSD use.

Subjects:

The subjects consisted of two groups--users (N=39) and non users (N=10). The users, of whom 31 were males and 8 were females, had all used LSD in a non-medical setting, and expressed some intention of using the drug again in a similar setting. The age ranged from 16 to 28, and the level of educational attainment varied from sophomore in high school to more than two years of graduate school. The predominance of subjects, however, were single, undergraduate males (N=16). This aspect is explained by a number of factors, the most influential of which

was the method of subject procurement. Because of the illegal and therefore underground use of LSD, it was necessary to obtain subjects in some manner other than open advertising. Also, due to the local police tactics of infiltrating paid informers into the culture, it was of great importance for us to avoid identification as narcotics agents. Such identification would have cost the cooperation of the subjects as well as putting us in the position of potential victims of a "put-on" or hoax. With these factors in mind, the only practical method was to follow association patterns, obtaining the trust and cooperation of the subjects by having a third party vouch for the researcher's "respectability" and non-informer status. The most successful argument used to obtain cooperation was that we had "no point to prove" but were merely attempting to view the issue objectively. In this context, avoidance of the judgmental term "abuse" when inquiring about patterns of use was an important part of our stance of sympathetic interest. Even with all the special efforts made, we had little success in getting cooperation from some of the very heavy users in the drop-out, mountain residing subculture.

The non user group was obtained at a later data and was matched for education and age. One segment of this group (N=6) was obtained from a sample of under-graduate psychology students to whom all test data had been administered except for the interview. Since these controls were persons who had used neither marijuana, LSD-25 nor any other psychedelic, it was possible to advertise in class for subjects. This group was selected because peer ratings on the dimensions of the MSGO (Miskimins, 1967) were available on these subjects thereby allowing the interviewers to check the degree of agreement between their ratings and those of knowledgeable peers.

This group can, in many ways, be considered almost as an anti-user group. All were volunteers to represent a non using group. In addition, in spite of a

portion of the introductory course greared to instruction regarding drugs and drug use, almost every subject in this group cited factually distorted reasons for not using drugs (e.g., marijuana leads to physiological addiction, etc.). All gave negative, stereotypic pictures of drug users and claimed that they had no users in their circle of acquaintances.

In general, they conformed well to Matza's analogy of the matron who attempts infidelity but discovers she is not willing after all. Because of this she senses "her fidelity with a certainty unknown among the untried. Among those for whom the matter seems closed, fidelity remains an article of faith. They may never know whether they are the kinds of persons destined to remain faithful--and dimly they know it. Not surprisingly, therefore they are for strict enforcement." (Matza, 1969)

In the following section, I want to deal with three general questions. First, does the user of LSD have a better understanding of himself and his behavior than the non user? Second, in what ways, if any, is the user alienated from society and what are the personality correlates of such alienation? Third, in a broad sense, how adequate in his psychological functioning compared to the non user?

In order to deal with the first question of self understanding, we shall look at certain variables in Table II, namely: understanding of self in general; understanding of motives; understanding of self in interpersonal relationships, both generally and with superiors; understanding of the other in interpersonal relationships, both generally and with superiors; and the ability to percieve, and use changes in himself.

The patterns for those variables dealing with self understanding are well exemplified by the variable "How well does he understand his motives."--the second variable from the top in Table II. The mean ratings for both pot and LSD range from 5.39 for the non user to the more unfavorable ratings of 4.30 and 4.33 for

the heavy user. As can be seen from the right-hand side of the table, significant t-values were yielded for four of the six user vs. non user comparisons, but none for comparisons between user groups.

As can be seen on the other understanding variables, there is, in every case, a significant difference between no use and heavy use groups. In general then, the heavy users were judged to understand themselves and others less well than did the non users.

A related question is the one of degree of consistency between one's behavior and one's professed values, since, in some fundamental sense, a person who understands himself well will not ordinarily exhibit serious inconsistencies between values and behavior. The results concerning this issue can also be seen in Table II on the second page. These results indicate an inverse relationship between amount of use and the degree of consistency. Some of the difference can be explained by the fact that even though many users aspired to professional positions which they often saw as allowing them sufficient freedom to permit them to live in the realities of society with a minimum of compromise of their values and ideals, they continued to engage in a social practice, which if detected could deny them access to that position.

A concern about the relationship between values and behavior is naturally related to the issue of just what values and social attitudes are held by the using group. How seriously should one take the popular descriptions of the users as alienated from the traditional values of our society and hostile toward the traditional authorities?

To answer this question, we must look at the variables listed in Table I. The first cluster of variables consists of the following dimensions--value-goal, clarity of future plans, level of aspiration, and time perspective. On all were obtained significant differences between the users and non user groups, but

few among user groups.

In general, the users tended to be less committed to normal goals and to live in the present. They were politically alienated, but were not activists, with most falling near the apathetic end of the political involvement scale. This is in contrast to the non users who were highly committed to current societal values and had clear-cut future plans.

When we look at the variables of religious conventionality and intensity on Table I--the sixth and seventh variables from the top--we see that even though there were dramatic differences in the degree of committment to a formal or organized religion, there were no differences between users and non users in the level of religious feeling and intensity. In other words, in spite of differences in the committment to conventional religious expression, both users and non users were rated as having similar levels of personal religious feeling.

Many of the differences in this and the previous section of behavior-value consistency may well be due to the fact that all of the interviewed users expressed both an alienation from and discontentment with the usually professed societal values and goals and also expressed a searching for values and goals which would allow them to lead satisfying and meaningful lives. The non users, on the other hand, were strongly committed to goals and plans of action, and were thus more easily able to be seen as knowing what they were doing.

With respect to the understanding of self and others, we have seen that heavier use is associated with lesser understanding. With respect to alienation from traditional values, however, we see that even the light and infrequent users are, in almost every case, as alienated as the heavy users. On these variables, then, it appears that qualitative differences between users and non users may be influencing the data, that is to say that there may be a type of user versus non user dichotomy on these variables. If such is the case, it leads one to speculate

that alienation is probably an antecedent of use because one's level of alienation is apparently not much related to degree of use.

Turning to the question of hostility (again I refer to Table II, page 2), we found that the degree of hostility was directly related to the degree of drug use, and was directed, in most cases, toward the establishment in general and the police in particular. In many cases, however, the main difference between user and non user appeared to be that the user had a greater vocalization of hostility and directed it more toward general figures of authority. The non users tended to direct their hostility toward hippies and users.

At the time of the interviews, however, the hostility of most users was coupled with what might be termed an apathetic alienation--a total disillusionment with the "establishment", but expressed in a desire to "drop-out" of that establishment and an attempt "to do their own thing."

The third area of concern lies in the general psychological functioning and adequacy of the users. There are two aspects to functioning as we have conceived of it here. The first refers to the feelings or self-report of competence and happiness as indicated by the variables listed first in Table IV. The second aspect referred to judgments of competence and happiness as shown in Table III. It is important to examine the self-report separately from judgmental ratings by others since the users might be suspected of deluding themselves in regard to their competence, creativity, and the like.

Looking at Table IV, we see that only in certain instances, specifically the "happy" and "in control of life" variables do the users see themselves as less well off than the non users see themselves.

The judged ratings on Table III generally reflect the same pattern, except that the judges did not see the users as less happy. (This discrepancy might well be due to the self-raters interpreting the happy-sad dimension as a contented

versus discontented with life variable.) It is important to note that there was no evidence of a greater tendency toward distortion or discrepancy from judged ratings on the part of the users than there was on the part of the non users. All persons, both user and non users, tended to rate themselves more favorably than the judges rated them. Users exhibited no greater tendency toward a favorable self picture than did the non users.

Furthermore, examination of the variables referring to creativity and competence for jobs reveals some trend toward the users being almost as adequate (in the case of competence for jobs) and more adequate (in the case of creativity).

The area of academic competence posed a problem in that the users often stated goals involving high academic achievement, but had overall grade point averages in the C+ range. Although on the basis of the discrepancy one might expect the user to be less intelligent than the non user; in fact, the measures of intelligence and creativity gave the edge to the users by both self-report and judgments by others. Th trend was not significant however.

A possible explanation to the academic discrepancy was contained in interview statements by the users that they did not do well in required courses that were unable to capture their interest, but did very well in courses of meaning to them.

The users were also judged as seeing themselves as and being less in control of their lives (Tables III and IV). The question now becomes whether the pattern of less than adequate functioning in the area of control of one's life, and success in dealing with it provide a basis for understanding alienation. If so, then it can be hypothesized that the drug users see others, specifically the institutions, as in control of their lives and preventing them from living them as they choose. This feeling, then, seems to lead to frustration with and ensuing hostility directed toward those social institutions. While our quantitative data do not provide a direct test of this hypothesis, subsequent conversations with

participants in the study give us considerable confidence that a sense of being controlled and thwarted by external agencies plays an important role in the alienation of the users.

In summary, we have seen that the users have not received any increased understanding of themselves or others from their use of psychedelics. In fact, the heaviest users are clearly performing in a less adequate way than the non users with respect to self-understanding. The importance of the relationship between drug use and an inadequate psychological profile is increased by two facts: 1) all of the judges were basically sympathetic and favorable toward the drug using subculture; 2) peer-ratings by persons who were untrained in the use of the dimensions generally corroborated the ratings given by the trained judges.

But one should not be too hasty in assuming a general psychological inadequacy. With respect to most of the important domains of competency and capacity, such as intelligence, creativity, competence on jobs, and capacity to handle their own problems, users are not noticably worse off than non users. The key area of discrepancy lies in the user's sense that he does not have the desired level of control over his life. This sense of external control is, in our judgment, the key to the user's alienation from conventional goals and values--an alienation that runs strongly through all using groups, even the lightest.

In other words, the inadequate functioning of the users does not appear to be a lack of capability (as is demonstrated by the lack of the expected significance on the ability items such as intelligence and creativity), but appears, rather, to be attributable to a lack of committment to normal goals, values, and institutions (see Part II--value-goal, religion).

Although this study identified a relationship between drug use and a profile of less adequate functioning, in certain respects, almost no data were provided on causality, direction or duration of the relationship. The data provided no basis

for suggesting that the relationship results either because drug use produces a deterioration of functioning, or, on the other hand, because persons who feel unhappy and inadequate in handling their problems seek out drugs as either an answer or an escape. Nor do the data provide either support or refutation of the possibility that drugs are just a phase through which many persons pass in some form of search.

In conclusion, then, we have seen that an alienation from conventional society and its values, a lack of committment to a formal organized religion, a searching for values, a lack of clear goals, and a certain psychological ineffectiveness seem to be characteristic of the user. As one thinks about these patterns, however, it becomes clear that one is dealing with differences in way of life or life style rather than basic traits of personality. In fact, the clearest results we obtained were that differences in the degree or frequency of use of the hallucinogenic drugs have little systematic relationship with personality patterns as reported by the self or judges.

One of the major problems faced by this study and any other research directed toward groups holding greatly divergent values was to develop and define dimensions which cut across all the groups. Although this study permits one to conclude that there are significant differences on many dimensions between those who accept the values of our present society and those who reject the values of that society, much work still remains to be done in terms of mapping out the actual values, strengths and characteristics of the user of hallucinogenic drugs.

The problems of generalization is further complicated by the fact that the sample was drawn from a population which varied little between user and non user, and which would probably be judged as basically normal and well-adjusted in comparison to most other samples (the sample was over-weighted with students due to the difficulties of contacting persons who had truly rejected the society).

In any further research, attention must also be paid to those who only use "pot" or LSD infrequently and are still very much part of the "establishment" in most other ways. Great care must be taken to avoid the type of item which can identify the drug user only as pathological or escapist, since much more seems to be involved.

## REFERENCES


Alpert, Richard. "Round-table on LSD." Paper presented at National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Drug Education Conference, Washington D.C., November, 1966.

Eddy, N. H., et al., "Drug Dependence: Its Significance and Characteristics," Bull. Wld. Hlth. Org. 1965, 32, 721-733.

Louria, D. Nightmare Drugs. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1966.

Masters, R. E. L., and Houston, Jean, The Varieties of Psychedelic Experience. New York: Dell Books, 1966.

Masters, R. E. L., "Sex, Ecstasy and the Psychedelic Drugs," Playboy, 1967, 14 (11), 94.

Matza, Deviance. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., 1969.

Miskimins, R. W., "Miskimins Self-Goal-Other Discrepancy Scale (MSGO)," Fort Collins, Colorado: Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, 1967.

Miskimins, R. W., "The Concept of Self and Psychopathology," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1967.

Miskimins, R. W., Manual: MSGO Discrepancy Scale. Fort Collins: RMBSI, 1968.

Roseman, B., The Peyote Story. Hollywood: Wilshire Book Co., 1966.

Roseman, B., LSD: The Age of Mind. Hollywood: Wilshire Book Co., 1967.

Smith, J. P., "LSD: The False Illusion," FDA Papers, 1967, 1, 10-18.

Watts, Alan, The Joyous Cosmology. New York: Random House, 1962.

TABLE I

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY USE OF MARIJUANA AND LSD
ON PART II OF INTERVIEW GUIDE

| | | Means | | | | Significant t-values | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Nonusers vs Users | | | Between Use Levels | | |
| Variable | | None | Lt | Med. | Hvy. | 1-2 | 1-3 | 1-4 | 2-3 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
| Value - Goal | Pot[a] | 1.95 | 4.68 | 4.05 | 5.41 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | * |
| Make Money - Drop Out | LSD[a] | | 4.27 | 5.03 | 5.21 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity Fut. Plans | Pot[a] | 5.75 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.15 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Confused - Clear | LSD[a] | | 3.43 | 2.67 | 3.08 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Level of Aspiration | Pot[a] | 4.75 | 3.50 | 3.92 | 3.89 | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Trivial - Unattainable | LSD[a] | | 3.64 | 3.57 | 4.13 | ** | * | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time Perspective | Pot[a] | 6.05 | 3.15 | 3.61 | 2.30 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | * |
| Present - Future | LSD[a] | | 3.57 | 2.80 | 2.21 | ** | ** | ** | --- | * | --- |
| Political Alienation | Pot[a] | 2.55 | 4.24 | 4.28 | 5.19 | ** | ** | ** | --- | * | --- |
| Pro-Estab. - Alienated | LSD[a] | | 4.27 | 4.67 | 4.75 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Relig. Conventionality | Pot[a] | 3.55 | 5.96 | 5.69 | 6.33 | ** | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Fundamentalist - Atheist | LSD[a] | | 6.05 | 5.70 | 6.08 | ** | * | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Relig. [illegible] | Pot | 3.45 | 3.67 | 4.69 | 3.59 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deeply R[illegible]d Issue | LSD | | 4.02 | 4.13 | 3.62 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictability | Pot[a] | 4.90 | 3.68 | 4.08 | 3.37 | * | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Unstructured - Structured Life | LSD[a] | | 4.09 | 3.73 | 2.79 | --- | --- | ** | --- | ** | --- |
| Recreation | Pot | 2.55 | 2.87 | 3.36 | 3.22 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Active - Passive | LSD[a] | | 2.62 | 3.80 | 3.50 | --- | ** | --- | ** | ** | --- |
| Poss. of Self-Change | Pot[a] | 5.90 | 4.81 | 4.47 | 4.37 | ** | ** | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Determinism - Self Controlled | LSD[a] | | 4.68 | 4.80 | 4.16 | * | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |

* t significant at .05 level of significance
** t significant at .01 level of significance
[a] Overall F-ratio was significant $p < .05$

TABLE II

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY USE OF MARIJUANA AND LSD
ON PART III OF INTERVIEW GUIDE

| Variable | | Means[b] 1 None | 2 Lt | 3 Med. | 4 Hvy. | Significant t-values: Nonusers vs Users 1-2 | 1-3 | 1-4 | Between Use Levels 2-3 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Understand Self Generally | Pot[a] | 5.25 | 4.85 | 4.58 | 4.22 | --- | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.65 | 4.73 | 4.42 | * | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Understand Motives | Pot[a] | 5.39 | 4.89 | 4.50 | 4.30 | --- | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.75 | 4.63 | 4.33 | * | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Understand Self in Interpersonal Relationships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generally | Pot[a] | 5.35 | 5.07 | 4.86 | 4.56 | --- | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 5.06 | 4.73 | 4.62 | --- | * | * | --- | --- | --- |
| With Superiors | Pot[a] | 5.45 | 4.93 | 4.53 | 4.45 | --- | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.92 | 4.43 | 4.42 | --- | ** | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Understands other in Interpersonal Relationships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generally | Pot[a] | 5.40 | 4.91 | 4.83 | 4.48 | --- | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.75 | 4.87 | 4.79 | * | --- | ' | --- | --- | --- |
| With Superiors | Pot[a] | 5.50 | 4.83 | 4.53 | 4.22 | * | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.33 | * | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |

' t significant at .06 level of significance

(Table II Continued)

TABLE II (Cont.)

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BY USE OF MARIJUANA AND LSD ON PART III OF INTERVIEW GUIDE

| Variable | | Means[b] 1 None | 2 Lt | 3 Med. | 4 Hvy. | Significant t-values: Nonusers vs Users 1-2 | 1-3 | 1-4 | Between Use Levels 2-3 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Perceived Changes in Self | Pot[a] | 5.65 | 5.30 | 4.59 | 4.48 | --- | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 5.10 | 4.97 | 4.25 | ** | ** | ** | * | * | --- |
| Used Changes in Self | Pot[a] | 5.30 | 4.94 | 4.47 | 4.22 | --- | --- | * | --- | * | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.71 | 4.77 | 4.25 | --- | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Value - Behavior Consistency | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generally | Pot[a] | 5.85 | 5.15 | 4.83 | 4.93 | * | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 5.19 | 5.20 | 4.25 | * | * | ** | --- | * | * |
| Career | Pot[a] | 6.10 | 4.83 | 4.33 | 4.22 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.83 | 4.30 | 4.08 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Religious | Pot[a] | 6.35 | 5.70 | 5.47 | 5.41 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 5.71 | 5.50 | 5.25 | * | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic | Pot[a] | 5.45 | 4.52 | 4.33 | 4.92 | * | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.62 | 4.77 | 4.12 | * | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Understand Capabilities | Pot[a] | 5.95 | 5.00 | 4.61 | 4.89 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.92 | 5.03 | 4.46 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Exhibits Hostility | Pot[a] | 1.75 | 2.72 | 2.75 | 3.52 | * | --- | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 2.54 | 3.30 | 3.42 | --- | * | ** | --- | --- | --- |

* t significant at .05 level of significance
** t significant at .01 level of significance
[a] Overall F-ratio was significant $p < .05$
[b] The higher the numerical value, the more the quality was present.

TABLE III

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MSGO JUDGMENTAL RATINGS
BY LSD AND MARIJUANA USE

| Variable | | Means[b] 1 None | 2 Lt | 3 Med. | 4 Hvy. | Significant t-values: Nonusers vs Users 1-2 | 1-3 | 1-4 | Between Use Levels 2-3 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intelligent | Pot | 2.85 | 3.11 | 3.19 | 2.82 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 3.17 | 3.03 | 2.83 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Creative | Pot | 4.50 | 4.17 | 4.28 | 3.44 | --- | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.41 | 3.80 | 3.33 | --- | --- | * | --- | * | --- |
| Successful in Life | Pot[a] | 3.50 | 4.59 | 4.97 | 4.93 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.54 | 5.07 | 5.08 | ** | ** | ** | --- | --- | --- |
| Competant | Pot | 3.65 | 4.43 | 4.56 | 4.30 | * | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.34 | 4.70 | 4.37 | * | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Handle Personal Problems | Pot[a] | 3.60 | 4.20 | 4.53 | 5.11 | --- | --- | * | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.43 | 4.67 | 4.54 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In Control of Life | Pot[a] | 2.90 | 4.07 | 4.94 | 5.56 | * | ** | ** | --- | * | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.59 | 4.73 | 4.87 | ** | * | * | --- | --- | --- |
| Happy | Pot | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.72 | 5.30 | --- | --- | --- | --- | * | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.45 | 4.87 | 4.71 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Concerned for others | Pot[a] | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.36 | 4.70 | --- | * | * | --- | --- | --- |
| | LSD | | 4.18 | 4.26 | 4.29 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alert | Pot[a] | 2.90 | 3.33 | 4.28 | 4.15 | --- | * | * | --- | * | --- |
| | LSD[a] | | 3.57 | 4.33 | 3.79 | --- | * | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Keep word | Pot[a] | 2.95 | 4.37 | 3.67 | 4.89 | * | --- | * | --- | --- | * |
| | LSD[a] | | 4.00 | 4.60 | 4.58 | --- | * | * | --- | --- | --- |

* t significant at .05 level of significance
** t significant at .01 level of significance
[a] Overall F-ratio was significant $p < .05$
[b] The lower the numerical value, the favorable the rating.

TABLE IV

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MSGO SELF REPORT
BY LSD AND MARIJUANA USE

| | | Means[a] | | | | Significant t-values | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Nonusers vs Users | | | Between Use Levels | | |
| Variable | | None | Lt | Med. | Hvy. | 1-2 | 1-3 | 1-4 | 2-3 | 2-4 | 3-4 |
| Intelligent | Pot | 3.10 | 2.56 | 2.42 | 2.22 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 2.62 | 3.10 | 3.50 | | * | | | | |
| Creative | Pot | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.75 | 3.00 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 3.62 | 3.10 | 3.50 | | | | | | |
| Successful in Life | Pot | 2.80 | 3.94 | 4.08 | 3.44 | ' | ' | | | | |
| | LSD | | 4.29 | 3.40 | 3.38 | * | | | | | |
| Competant | Pot | 2.80 | 3.56 | 3.83 | 3.33 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 3.52 | 3.60 | 3.75 | | | | | | |
| Handle Personal Problems | Pot | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.44 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 3.43 | 3.10 | 3.38 | | | | | | |
| In Control of Life | Pot | 2.80 | 4.06 | 4.83 | 5.22 | | * | * | | | |
| | LSD | | 4.48 | 4.50 | 4.88 | * | | * | | | |
| Happy | Pot | 2.60 | 3.67 | 4.17 | 4.13 | * | * | ' | | | |
| | LSD | | 4.00 | 3.60 | 4.14 | * | | | | | |
| Concerned for others | Pot | 2.30 | 3.11 | 2.75 | 2.33 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 3.43 | 2.20 | 2.00 | ' | | | * | * | |
| Alert | Pot | 2.50 | 3.22 | 3.08 | 3.00 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 3.29 | 2.90 | 3.00 | | | | | | |
| Keep Word | Pot | 2.80 | 3.89 | 3.08 | 3.67 | | | | | | |
| | LSD | | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.25 | | | | | | |

' t significant at .06 level of significance
* t significant at .05 level of significance
** t significant at .01 level of significance

a the lower the mean, the more favorable the rating.